

Amtdt. dated January 5, 2005

Reply to Office action of October 5, 2004

RECEIVED

CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Serial No. 09/809,759

Docket No. ROC920000170US1

Firm No. 0021.0013

JAN 0 5 2005

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-54 are in the case. The applicants have studied the office action dated October 5, 2004 and have made the changes believed appropriate. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103(b) as being unpatentable over Montalbano, U.S. Pat. No. 5,918,237. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, for example, is directed to a computer implemented method for verifying a network address, comprising: *inter alia*, accessing a network address included within a file; ... providing a substitute network address if the accessed content did not satisfy the qualifying threshold ; and in response to a user input, substituting within the file the substitute network address for the accessed network address." It is the Examiner's position that the Montalbano reference teaches finding an embedded URL which identifies the location of an associated multimedia bookmark description (MBD). However, the Examiner has cited no portion of the Montalbano reference which teaches or suggests providing a substitute URL, and in response to a user input, substituting within the file the substitute URL. Instead, it appears that the Montalbano reference is directed to storing a bookmark which includes the MBD stored at the embedded URL. Thus it is clear that the Examiner has cited no portion of the Montalbano reference which teaches or suggests "providing a substitute network address if the accessed content did not satisfy the qualifying threshold ; and in response to a user input, substituting within the file the substitute network address for the accessed network address." Independent claims 19 and 37 may be distinguished in a similar manner.

The rejection of the dependent claims is improper for the reasons given above. Furthermore, the dependent claims include additional limitations, which in combination with the base and intervening claims from which they depend provide still further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Amdt. dated January 5, 2005  
Reply to Office action of October 5, 2004

Serial No. 09/809,759  
Docket No. ROC920000170US1  
Firm No. 0021.0013

The Examiner has made various comments concerning the obviousness of certain features of the present inventions. Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants have addressed those comments directly hereinabove or the Examiner's comments are deemed moot in view of the above response.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicants submit that the pending claims 1-54 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0585.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: January 5, 2005

By: 

William K. Konrad  
Registration No. 28,868

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor  
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP  
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210  
Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
Tel: 310-553-7977  
Fax: 310-556-7984